ARCHAEOLOGICAL SALVAGE RECORDING ALONG THE ROUTE OF THE CHADBURY TO TYWFORD LINK ROAD, EVESHAM, WORCESTERSHIRE

Simon Sworn

With a contribution by Angus Crawford

Illustrated by Carolyn Hunt

25th November 2004

Historic Environment and Archaeology Service,
Worcestershire County Council,
Woodbury,
University College Worcester,
Henwick Grove,
Worcester WR2 6AJ

Project P2553
Report 1287
WSM 33603

Contents

Archaeological salvage recording along the Chadbury to Twyford Link Road, Evesham, Worcestershire

Simon Sworn

Part 1 Project summary

Between May and July 2004, Worcestershire Historic Environment and Archaeological Service undertook an archaeological watching brief along the route of the new link road between Chadbury and Twyford, to the northwest of Evesham, Worcestershire (NGR SP 0250 4630 – SP 1390 4615). It was undertaken on behalf of Sir William Halcrow and Partners Ltd. The watching brief formed the final stage of archaeological work on the site, following a desk-based assessment, a co-ordinated geophysical and field walking survey and an evaluation, comprising three trenches situated at various points along the length of the link road. The evaluations proved to be inconclusive, but the majority of the new route was under apple orchards at the time so was not conducive to either a complete fieldwalking or geophysical survey. It was felt that with a large area of the new route having the potential to effect sites that had not yet been identified, and the close proximity to the site of the 1265 Battle of Evesham, that an archaeological watching brief should take place during all groundworks along the length of the route, allied with a complete metal detecting survey.

Overall the results of the watching brief, allied to the other preliminary work show that the development area was devoid of any significant archaeological remains from any period. A small number of ephemeral features and a thin scattering of various artefacts indicate that this area to the northwest of Evesham has always made use of the exceptionally good soil qualities and has been utilised solely for agricultural purposes. Despite the close proximity to the battlefield site of the 1265 Battle of Evesham, there was no evidence that this action had impinged on the area of land within the road development area.

Part 2 Detailed report

1. Background

1.1 Reasons for the project

An archaeological watching brief was undertaken along the route of the new Chadbury-Twyford link road, Evesham, Worcestershire (NGR SP 0250 4630 – SP 1390 4615), on behalf of Sir William Halcrow and Partners Ltd. This 1.6 mile link road runs between the A4538 at Chadbury and the A46 at Twyford, to the north west of Evesham, and planning consent had been granted by Worcestershire County Council (ref: 603062). The route of the new road had the potential to affect several archaeological sites (WSM 23241, 23243, 23247 and 23338). A prior geophysical survey had identified a number of areas of potential archaeological remains along the proposed route, and these were investigated in 1996 by the excavation of a number of evaluation trenches. Although the evaluation trenching failed to identify any considerable archaeological deposits of note, the potential that the new road could affect sites yet identified was quite high, as the previous land use for market gardening inhibited fieldwalking or the use of aerial photography. Previous fieldwalking and evaluation trenching identified scatters of Roman, medieval and post-medieval pottery, which although likely to have derived from manuring, could have been indicators of as yet undiscovered sites.

The battlefield of the Battle of Evesham (1265)

It was unlikely on present knowledge that the proposed road development was going to have any adverse archaeological impact on the true battlefield site given the consensus of historiographical opinion that the focus for the battle was on the southern brow of Green Hill (Cox 1988), and thus mainly down-slope towards the River Avon (i.e. mainly to the southeast of the present road). The impact of the development may in fact be beneficial, as it will take further north a route used by heavy traffic, and therefore, more towards the edge of the 'battlefield' as defined by English Heritage (WSM 4386, Fig 2). However, given the sparsity of the primary documentary evidence, the watching brief provided an opportunity for archaeology to enhance our knowledge of this important battle (Hurst 2003).

1.2 Project parameters

The project conforms to the *Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief* (IFA 1999). The project also conforms to a brief prepared by Worcestershire County Council (HEAS 2004a) and for which a project proposal (including detailed specification) was produced (HEAS 2004b).

1.3 Aims

The aims of the archaeological watching brief were to observe all ground breaking, the removal of the topsoil and subsoil, and the excavations for any associated services trenches with regard to locating any archaeological deposits and to determine, if present, their extent, state of preservation, date and type. More specifically, the route of the proposed road ran close to the location of the 1265 Battle of Evesham and part of the new road impinges on the northeast corner of the of the officially designated battlefield site (English Heritage, see above and Fig 2). Due to the fragmented nature of the evidence with regard to the exact location or the full extent of the battlefield site there was a possibility that the watching brief could provide further insight into the nature and understanding of this important battle, thereby assisting in future management of the battlefield. With that in mind the full length of the new road was metal detected, specifically looking for medieval metal fragments on the site.

2. Methods

2.1 Prior archaeological work

Prior to the instigation of the road development, a series of detailed archaeological work had taken place along the proposed route. In 1996 a fieldwalking and geophysical survey took place along with a series of evaluation trenching (WSM 23241, 23552 and 23338). In each case the potential for the discovery of buried archaeological remains was hindered by the presence of extensive areas of mature orchard trees (Hurst 2003).

2.2 Current watching brief

The study area was defined as a watching brief covering the total length of the new route, which replaces part of the A4538 at Chadbury, to the northwest of Evesham (formerly the northern part of the B4084) towards the junction of the A4184 and A46 at Twyford. The watching brief was carried out at various times between May and July 2004 along the entire length of the new link road integrated with the construction programme. All groundworks were observed, including the machine excavation of service trenches and associated drainage ditches. A complete metal detector survey was carried out, including the spoil heaps, in line with the recommendations laid out in the proposal. All observed artefacts were retrieved and

selected deposits were cleaned and excavated by hand. Recording followed standard practice (CAS, 1995).

Structural analysis

All fieldwork records for the watching brief were checked and cross-referenced. Analysis was affected through a combination of structural and artefactual evidence, allied to the information derived from other sources.

2.3 Artefact analysis

2.3.1 Artefact recovery policy

All finds were recovered by hand and in accordance with the standard Service practice (CAS 1995; appendix 2). In addition, a metal detector (operated by a specialist user) was also used to locate and retrieve all forms of metal artefacts, including iron, from the topsoil, subsoil and any archaeological features. All metal finds were spatially recorded at an appropriate scale. This was a specific requirement due to the proximity of the new route to the 1265 battlefield site. All observed finds were retrieved.

2.3.2 Method of analysis

All hand retrieved finds were examined. They were identified, quantified and dated to period. A *terminus post quem* date was produced for each stratified context. The date was used for determining the broad date of phases defined for the site. All information was recorded on *pro forma* sheets. Pottery fabrics are referenced to the fabric reference series maintained by the Service (Hurst 1994).

2.4 Environment

No deposits suitable for environmental analysis were identified in the course of this project.

2.5 The methods in retrospect

A limited amount earthmoving (Area E) had taken place prior to the archaeologist being appointed.

Problems caused by the adverse weather conditions during the initial phase of soil removal led to the churning up of much of the ground surface in Areas A and E before it had been sufficiently observed, leading to the conditions of access and visibility not being ideal. In certain locations in Areas A and B and throughout Area C the topsoil and subsoil was only required to be stripped to a level that was considerably higher than the level of the underlying natural, therefore restricting the potential of observing any archaeological deposits or features that may have existed, though, should they have been present, they would have been unaffected by the construction works.

3. Topographical and archaeological context

The length of the study area was *c*1.6km long (from SP 0250 4630-1390 4615), and *c.*20m wide, and also included the access roads and service trench locations. This included parts of two civil parishes (Evesham, and Norton and Lenchwick). Present-day land-use is largely apple orchard, and there are smaller areas of arable, and pasture.

3.1 *Geology and soils*

The geology is lower Lias clay (1:50,000 sheet 200), except for an area of gravels at the east end of the route, these sandy gravels were revealed during evaluation trenching and also during the watching brief with the construction of the flanking drainage ditches either side of the road. The gravels were also noticed during the excavation for the water run-off tank at the far eastern end of Area A.

The soils are mainly Evesham 2 Series (calcareous pelosols), with a small area of Bishampton 2 Series (argillic brown earth) at the east end of the proposed route (Ragg *et al* 1984). The brown earths are widely used for arable cultivation, and the pelosol for pasture, the latter also being used for orchards where it occurs on valley slopes. Local variations in the underlying geology are noted within the results for each area.

3.2 *Archaeological background*

Generally little systematic fieldwork has been carried out in this area, and there were no secondary sources giving an overview for the archaeology of the Evesham area outside the urban core. Generally the area is well known for sites discovered by aerial photography. Cropmark evidence shows that there was widespread early settlement in the area (Webster and Hobley 1964), but the extent of this is so far restricted to the gravels along the River Avon where the cropmarks are best developed. Roman finds have been recorded just to the north of Evesham (WSM 2759, 23490), but there is very little archaeological evidence for the sub-Roman and Saxon periods. However, the present settlement pattern in the Evesham area derives from this time. In general terms the medieval period saw the creation of much of the character of the present-day landscape, with the development of villages and towns and the construction of parish churches. The medieval open fields and commons have been largely superseded by smaller individually owned fields, mostly enclosed in the 18th and 19th centuries, and nearly all of the visible landscape has been altered since the medieval period.

Accordingly only a very general historical context could be established at the outset of the assessment. Just outside the area of development much more evident archaeological sites are known, and so it is very unlikely that the ground affected by the proposed route has been devoid of all activity. Some principal sites in the general vicinity of the proposed road development are, for instance, a probable Iron Age hillfort at Chadbury (WSM 2767) which overlooks the site to the north-west, and sites of Roman occupation revealed by cropmarks or scatters of finds on the field surface (WSM 2759, 23290) and which lie just beyond the road development area road at its east end.

3.3 *The Battle of Evesham in 1265* (after Hurst 2003)

The Battle of Evesham in 1265 was fought to the north end of the town, and the battlefield has been defined officially by English Heritage (WSM 4386, Fig 2). The battle was fought between Simon de Montford (a baron who had taken Henry III hostage), and forces led by Edward (son of King Henry III, and later king himself as Edward I), the Earl of Gloucester and Mortimer.

The main scene of the battle action is not disputed and was (and still is) known as *Green Hill*, a name which probably indicates that it was once common pasture for the town (Cox 1988, 13), and so was a likely place to select for a battle where mounted knights would not be hindered by obstacles on the ground.

It is clearly difficult to establish with any certainty the exact positions occupied by any of the forces during the battle except in the most general of terms based on a consideration of strategy and likely tactical positions given the lie of the land. Despite these difficulties there are two principal theories about how the battle was played out: -

Battle scenario 1

Until quite recently the accepted view of the Battle of Evesham was that the forces of Edward were mainly ranged in a single long line just to the south of the A4538 (northern spur of B4084) and of Offenham Lane at the outset of the battle, thereby forming in a single line closing off movement to the north out of Evesham, and with any escape eastwards blocked at the Avon river bridge by Mortimer (part of Edward's army). During the battle it was assumed that the Montfordian forces, which were emerging from Evesham town and were concentrating on bursting through the opposing lines, were successful in pushing back that part of the opposing lines that they connected with. In such a scenario it is possible that some of the action spilled northwards of the A4538/Offenham (Blayneys) Lane. This version of the battle is described by Brian Horrocks in the video presentation shown at the Almonry Museum, and seems to be broadly followed by de Laborderie *et al* (1987), though in these cases the Edwardian line of battle is depicted about 300m south of the A4538 (former north spur of B4084)/Offenham Lane on the basis that the best tactical position would have been selected nearer the brow of the hill. This would be in keeping with the medieval accounts placing the focus of the battle south of the well (Cox 1988, 26).

Battle scenario 2

A more recent study of the battle by Cox (1988) has concluded that the Edwardian forces were staggered along and either side of the main road heading north out of Evesham, and included the force commanded by Mortimer, which in Scenario 1 was placed separate from the main Edwardian forces and to the south-east of the town. His plan of the battlefield puts the forces of Mortimer to the north of the A4538 (former north spur of B4084) just to the west of its intersection with the main road north of Evesham. This is the closest to the proposed new link road that any of the modern commentators on the battle places forces, and they are still just outside the study area covered in this assessment. This disposition of forces is followed by English Heritage (Fig 2). It should also be noted that Carpenter (1987) raised several objections to this particular interpretation of the battle lines.

Archaeological context

So far archaeological evidence has provided little useful for the study of the battlefield. A large medieval battle-axe that is on display in the Almonry Museum in Evesham was found in river silt of the River Avon, presumably lost during the rout of the Montfordians who attempted to escape east towards Offenham. A further detailed discussion of the battle and the various scenarios can be found in de Laborderie *et al* 1987 and Cox 1988.

4. Results

4.1 **Area A** (Figs 4-6)

Area A comprised the main body of the new route extending from the A4538 at Cadbury towards the junction of the A4184 and A46 at Twyford, a distance of 1.6 miles and roughly 150-200 meters in width. The watching brief involved the observation of the removal of the topsoil and most of the subsoil along its entire length. However the poor weather conditions meant that the ground quickly became churned up, making the observation of any archaeological remains very difficult. In two areas the ground level was to be significantly reduced, by the excavation of cuttings, which provided a chance to observe the underlying deposits (Fig 5, 6).

Prior to the start of the watching brief, large drainage ditches had already been excavated along considerable lengths on each side of the new route in this area. These ditches were roughly 2m wide and 1m deep. They had been excavated recently with a toothless 'V' shaped

bucket so that the sides of the ditches were sufficiently clean to establish that there was no visible archaeology in these areas. Even though the groundbreaking had not been observed it was clear that the areas exposed in the sides of the drainage ditches was archaeologically sterile. The drainage ditches extended well into the underlying natural blue clays along its entire length, yet the only visible features were frequent tree throws and heavy root disturbance. Most of the root disturbance originating from the modern apple orchard trees, which had originally extended across large areas of the site prior to the onset of works.

Also visible were considerable modern field drains, again cutting well into natural blue lias clays. These root disturbances would undoubtedly have disturbed and or destroyed many smaller ephemeral features that may have been present. Yet the lack of any material finds of any note make it much more likely that this area was devoid of any archaeological features in the first place. This possibility was confirmed by the lack of archaeological evidence from the two areas where the cuttings were to be located. Following the removal of the topsoil and subsoil here by a 360-degree machine excavator using a toothless bucket (*c* 1ha and 1.3ha, Fig 5,6), a metal detector and walkover survey was carried out and the machined surfaces were sufficiently clean to establish that there were no archaeological features present. In the area of the eastern cutting a detailed record was made of the natural clays, to a depth of 2.5m (see appendix and Fig 8, Section 5).

To the lower, western end of Area A, two parallel linear features (Fig 7) were observed after the removal of the subsoil. These two features were not well defined, but were clearly archaeological features. Both these linear features ran for roughly 60m in a northwest to southeast direction, 5-6m apart, but no more than 100mm deep. Both features contained fills that were similar to the overlying subsoil and contained fragments of charcoal. Although there was no directly associated dating evidence the form of these linear features suggested that they are cultivation marks, most likely the remains of ridge and furrow, though their date was unknown.

To the far west end of Area A, as the land drops down to the southern bank of the Lower Brook stream, an area of potential archaeological interest had been highlighted in the documentary search (Hurst 2003), a 'wash pool' (WSM 23241), first recorded on the 1846 tithe map, but no longer visible by 1887, and also absent from the Wood Norton estate map of 1920 (WCRO BA 5044/9). The wash pools were commonly constructed for the washing of the valuable wool of the sheep before shearing. This area was investigated as part of the 1996 evaluation, during which revealed a slight bank with disturbed ground, also a series if auger holes revealed medium brown clay containing brick/tile flecking and charcoal, which was consistent with disturbance that may indicate the site of the former wash pool. With the evaluation evidence for this wash pool being rather inconclusive it was hoped that during the construction of the new road that this area would have been stripped to provide a sufficiently clean surface for any archaeological deposits to be clearly observed. However, this area had been considerably disturbed prior to the start of the watching brief, the ground here having been heavily churned up, and then covered with a layer of crushed brick and concrete, making any observation as to the existence of the wash pool impossible.

In the area around the potential wash pool a linear holloway was defined, appearing on the 1846 tithe map and the later 1887 6-inch map. The holloway (WSM 23245-6) may have been part of the medieval saltway which runs under the present A4538, traces of which can still be seen as an earthwork to the south of the present road near the entrance to the Leicester Tower. Augering was undertaken in 1996 (WSM 23241) and may have picked up slight traces of the holloway, though not clearly defined. If this is the location of the holloway it suggests that the present road that follows the old saltway deviates here, turning west to the junction with the B4624 and crossing the stream 30m to the southwest of the original crossing point. .

All observed surface finds including those from the spoil heaps were collected and there were no artefacts of archaeological importance. The bulk of the metal finds that could be dated were from the 18th – 20th centuries. A total of six sherds of pottery were found with a date range between 16th – 20th centuries. Together these imply that there it was unlikely to have

been any substantial archaeological remains present and that the majority of the finds are probably derived from the manuring process during cultivation.

Though this area provided the largest potential for the discovery of any unknown buried archaeological features, the evidence from here suggest that this area was devoid of any significant remains, This could have come about from heavy truncation by later disturbance from the trees planted for the market gardening and/or from the high number of field drains running across these fields. Yet the most likely cause for the lack of features, is that this area has always been in agricultural use, rather than being an area of settlement.

4.2 **Area B** (Fig 4, 5)

An improvement in the unseasonable poor weather conditions allowed a clear and uninterrupted observation of the soil stripping in the southern half of this area. The northern half of Area B being built up to form an embankment approaching the new roundabout, and did not require the soil to be stripped to a depth that would have allowed any archaeological observations to take place. It was clear from the initial topsoil stripping in the southern sector that this area, to the east of the present B4624, has for some time been used as a dumping ground, both the topsoil and subsoil heavily laden with Victorian and 20th century waste, vast amounts of modern ceramic pottery fragments, glass, metalwork and plastics littering this area.

The southern end of Area B was stripped using a 360 degree machine excavator using a toothless bucket down onto the light blue lias clays. As with Area A, the surface was observed by a walkover survey, and here the surface was sufficiently clean to indicate that there were no archaeological features present, although the natural had been clearly truncated by a number of modern field drains and a modern brick culvert, all running in a westerly direction from the present road down slope towards the River Avon. Apart from the modern rubbish found within the topsoil and subsoil there were no other finds of note in this area. The whole of the stripped area including the spoil heaps was scanned with a metal detector, though the only metal find (26) came from within the backfill of a modern field drain and dates to the 19th-20th centuries. There were three sherds of pottery from this area, two were post-medieval and one was Roman, dated to the middle 1st–4th century. The lack of other associated Roman finds and the abraded nature of this mortaria fragment suggests that this was also present as a result of manuring carried out during field cultivation.

A service trench was excavated to a depth of 1.25m below the present ground surface, along the entire western edge of this area (Fig 5). The section was sufficiently clean to establish that there were no archaeological remains present.

The level of soil stripping in the southern half of this area and the sufficiently cleaned surfaces provided the clearest indication for the lack of any overall archaeological deposits on this site.

4.3 **Area C** (Fig 6)

The area to the northwest of the link road, linking the new road with the small lane leading off to Church Lench to the north, provided very little in both observed finds and archaeological features. This was an area where the 1996 evaluation trench (WSM 23338) had located several slight linear features but with no associated artefactual evidence, yet presumably the result of modern cultivation. Material recovered from the surface during this evaluation dated from the Roman, medieval and post-medieval periods, all of which was likely to have derived from the practice of manuring using domestic refuse, a well documented practice in the medieval period (Astill and Grant 1988, 79).

Although this area had potential for the existence of buried archaeology the nature of the road construction meant that only the topsoil and some of the subsoil was removed before the introduction of material to raise the ground level. There was roughly 0.20m of subsoil remaining above the underlying natural sand and gravels (Fig 6, 8, Sections 6, 7). The

incomplete removal of the subsoil meant that, firstly, not enough soil had been removed to sufficiently identify any archaeological features, including those initially found in the 1996 evaluation. Secondly, the lack of total soil removal meant that any buried archaeological features are likely to have remained preserved *in situ* under the sub-soil and freshly imported material. The subsoil left *in situ* and the spoil heads were metal detected and any surface finds were retrieved. The finds here, although undiagnostic, could be generally dated to the post-medieval period.

4.4 **Area D** (Fig 4-6)

A 31m trench was excavated in two stages across the existing A4538, close to the junction with the B4624 at Chadbury, and in the adjoining field to the west of the present road. The purpose of this trenching was to relocate the overhead electricity cables so that they would now run under the new road. In the eastern half, the trench was excavated through the road surface with a toothed bucket down to a depth of 1m. Apart from the road makeup and associated modern service trenches nothing of any interest was observed, and it was also the same in the western half of the trench, where the topsoil and subsoil was stripped with a toothless bucket to expose a clean surface which was, along with the sections, cleaned by hand. In both cases the access to and visibility to the trench allowed for a high degree of confidence that there were no archaeological features of any note. The natural was then removed to a depth of 1m to allow a safe location for the electricity cables. Finds gathered from the topsoil and subsoil were post-medieval. The deposits under the present road surface were metal detected, but without any positive results, though the presence of modern service trenches and cabling hampered this. The western half of the trench was not metal detected.

4.5 **Area E** (Fig 4)

Area E was located towards the far western end of the link road where it rejoined the existing A4538 at Chadbury, to the north of the Lower Brook. The geophysical survey suggested the potential for some buried remains of archaeological interest. But the 1996 evaluation (WSM 23252) revealed only very slight features, comprising two layers, one of which contained crushed brick and tile with associated 18th century pottery, the other layer/fill contained associated charcoal and medieval pottery (Hurst 2003). None of these archaeological remains could be associated with any of the anomalies recorded by the geophysical survey. The natural laminations and banding of the blue lias concentrations may have contributed to the geophysical data being suggestive of archaeological remains (Hurst 2003). As with the western end of Area A this area had been stripped of the topsoil and some subsoil, and it had been considerably disturbed prior to the start of the watching brief. After a walkover survey it was clearly evident that although the evaluation had provided little archaeological evidence, the watching brief would not be able to elaborate further. This area was to be raised above the present ground surface with the construction of an embankment to carry the new route over the Lower Brook to the south. There were no observed finds except modern brick and tile fragments.

5. Artefact Report (by A. Crawford)

5.1.1 Artefact recovery policy

All artefacts from the area of salvage recording were retrieved by hand and retained in accordance with the service manual (CAS 1995 as amended).

5.1.2 Method of analysis

All hand retrieved finds were examined. A primary record was made of all finds on a Microsoft Access 2000 database. Artefacts were identified, quantified and dated and a *terminus post quem* produced for each stratified context. Pottery was examined under x20 magnification and recorded by fabric type and form according to the fabric reference series maintained by the service (Hurst and Rees 1992).

5.2 Artefactual Analysis

A summary of the artefacts recovered can be seen in Table 2. The assemblage recovered from the watching brief came from seven contexts. The assemblage ranged in date from the Roman to modern periods. The recovered pottery assemblage consists of nine sherds, all which were retrieved from topsoil and subsoil contexts.

The pottery was identified and grouped by fabric and context (see Table 1). The majority of the sherds were undiagnostic but could be dated between the mid 1st and 20th century by fabric type. The remaining finds consisted of common building material such as roof tile fragments, fired clay, flint, vessel glass, and thirty metal finds recovered using a metal detector.

5.2.1 Discussion of the Artefacts

The discussion below is a summary of the finds and associated location or contexts by period. The importance of individual finds has been commented upon as necessary.

5.2.2 Roman

A single sherd of Roman pottery was identified within the assemblage. This was a sherd of West Midlands mortaria (fabric 34; context 200), broadly dated to the mid 1st to 4th century. The abraded condition of the sherd as well as the lack of other Roman material amongst the assemblage suggests that this is a residual sherd of Roman pottery.

5.2.3 Post-medieval

Five sherds of pottery were identified as post-medieval in date. Of these, four were of oxidized glazed Malvernian ware (fabric 69) with three sherds from context 100 and a single sherd from context 101. While oxidized glazed Malvernian ware was produced from the fourteenth to seventeenth century the remaining traces of glaze on some sherds suggest they were produced from the late 16th to early 17th century. All sherds displayed various degrees of abrasion, some substantial, which suggests that they were also residual. The remaining post-medieval pottery was a sherd of red sandy ware (fabric 78; context 200) also of unidentifiable form. Four small fragments of ceramic roof tile (context 100) could only be placed broadly within the post-medieval period.

5.2.4 **Modern**

The modern pottery consisted of only two sherds identified as miscellaneous modern ware (context 100) and a single sherd of Nottingham stoneware (fabric 81.3, context 200).

Of the metal detector finds, nine were modern in origin. These consisted of a partial tea spoon (context 100; Find 1), copper alloy buttons (Finds 3 and 19 from context 100 and find 23 from context 101), a partial shotgun casing (find 22, context 101), part of a copper alloy draw handle (find 17, context 100), and a copper alloy liquid strainer of unknown type (find 13, context 100).

Some nails and hardware fittings were placed in the modern assemblage purely due to their state of preservation but this does not exclude that they may be post-medieval in date. These included a nail (find 19, context 100) and two domed headed tacks similar to those used in upholstering (find 10, context 100 and find 26 context 201).

The remaining metal detector finds consisted of various slag types or were too corroded to be identified or dated conclusively. All metal detector finds are grouped by finds number and context in Table 3.

5.3 ***Significance***

All seven contexts from which the assemblage was retrieved contained modern material and therefore have been allocated a *terminus post quem* of modern date. The abraded condition of the pottery assemblage suggests plough action over a long period.

Context	Fabric Name	Fabric	Total	Weight (g).	Date range	Period
100	Miscellaneous modern wares	101	2	3	19-20C	Modern
100	Oxidized glazed Malvernian ware	69	3	89	L16-E17	Post-medieval
101	Oxidized glazed Malvernian ware	69	1	16	16-E17C	Post-medieval
200	West Midlands mortaria	34	1	36	M1-4C	Roman
200	Post-medieval ware	78	1	3	18-19C	Post-medieval
200	Nottingham stoneware	81.3	1	11	19-20C	Modern

Table 1: *Quantification of assemblage fabrics by context.*

Material	Type	Context	Finds no	Total	Weight (g).
Aluminium	Unidentified	101	20	1	0.5
Ceramic	Roof tile	100	0	7	80
Ceramic	Roof tile	124	0	8	432
Ceramic	Roof tile	300	0	5	35
Clay	Fired	100	0	2	20
Clay	Fired	200	0	1	1
Coal	Clinker	103	0	1	3
Copper alloy	Button	100	3	1	3
Copper alloy	Button	100	19	1	5
Copper alloy	Button	101	23	1	2
Copper alloy	Cap	101	7	1	2
Copper alloy	Casing	101	22	1	7
Copper alloy	Handle	100	17	1	5
Copper alloy	Spoon	100	1	1	3
Copper alloy	Strainer	100	13	1	43
Copper alloy	Tack	100	10	1	2
Copper alloy	Tack	201	26	1	0.5
Copper alloy	Unidentified	101	25	1	1
Copper alloy	Unidentified	301	30	1	0.5
Flint	Waste	100	0	4	36
Glass	Vessel	200	0	1	1
Iron	Fastner	100	6	1	6
Iron	Fastner	300	0	3	19
Iron	Nail	100	19	1	27
Iron	Slag	101	4	1	17
Iron	Slag	101	8	1	16
Iron	Slag	301	27	1	98
Iron	Spike	101	5	1	39
Iron	Spike	300	0	1	128
Iron	Unidentified	100	0	1	61
Iron	Unidentified	100	9	1	108
Iron	Unidentified	100	11	1	50
Iron	Unidentified	100	12	1	2
Iron	Unidentified	100	16	1	27
Iron	Unidentified	100	18	1	3
Iron	Unidentified	301	28	3	8
Lead	Unidentified	100	14	1	15
Lead	Unidentified	101	24	1	13
Lead	Unidentified	100	2	1	96
Lead	Unidentified	301	29	1	5
Lead	Unidentified	101	15	1	5
Clay pipe	Stem	101	0	1	1
Pottery	Modern	100	0	2	3
Pottery	Post- medieval	100	0	3	89
Pottery	Post- medieval	101	0	1	16
Pottery	Post- medieval	200	0	2	14
Pottery	Roman	200	0	1	36
Tin	Slag	101	21	1	5

Table 2: *Quantification of the assemblage*.

Find No.	Context	Material	Type	Date	Period
1	100	Copper Alloy	Spoon	18-20C	Modern
2	100	Lead	Unknown		
3	100	Copper Alloy	Button	18-19C	Modern
4	101	Iron	Slag		
5	101	Iron	Eyelet spike		
6	100	Iron	Hand made nail		
7	101	Copper Alloy	Brass locking cap	19-20C	Modern
8	101	Iron	Slag		
9	100	Iron	Fragment of Iron bar		
10	100	Copper Alloy	Tack	19-20C	Modern
11	100	Iron	Corroded flat piece of iron		
12	100	Iron	Piece of corroded Iron		
13	100	Copper Alloy	50 mm diameter strainer	19-20C	Modern
14	100	Lead	Lead capping?		
15	101	Lead	Lead scrap		
16	100	Iron	Coroded square rod		
17	100	Copper Alloy	Pull for draw handle	19-20C	Modern
18	100	Iron	Corroded piece of Iron		
19	100	Copper Alloy	Large coat button	19-20C	Modern
19	100	Iron	Large Iron nail	19-20C	Modern
20	101	Alum	Unidentified	19-20C	Modern
21	101	Tin	Slag		
22	101	Copper Alloy	Shotgun casing	19-20C	Modern
23	101	Copper Alloy	Button	18-19C	Modern
24	101	Lead	Unidentified		
25	101	Copper Alloy	Scrap copper		
26	201	Copper Alloy	Tack	19-20C	Modern
27	301	Iron	Slag		
28	301	Iron	Unidentified		
29	301	Lead	Unidentified		
30	301	Copper Alloy	Unidentified		

Table 3*: Metal detector finds by finds number (for spatial location see Figs 4-6).*

Artefact Type	Count	Weight (g).	Date	Specialist report?	Important research assemblage?
Roman Pottery	1	36	M1-4C	Y	N
Post-medieval pottery	4	105	L16-E17C	Y	N
Ceramic roof tile	4	68	13-18C	N	N
Post-medieval pottery	1	3	18-19C	Y	N
Copper alloy button	2	5	18-19C	N	N
Clay pipe stem	1	1	18-19C	N	N
Copper alloy spoon	1	3	18-20C	N	N
Iron spike	1	128	18-20C	N	N
Ceramic roof tile	5	35	18-20C	N	N
Ceramic roof tile	11	444	19-20C	N	N
Unidentified aluminium	1	0.5	19-20C	N	N
Copper alloy button	1	5	19-20C	N	N
Copper alloy cap	1	2	19-20C	N	N
Shotgun casing	1	7	19-20C	N	N
Copper alloy draw handle	1	5	19-20C	N	N
Copper alloy strainer	1	43	19-20C	N	N
Copper alloy tack	2	2.5	19-20C	N	N
Iron nail	1	27	19-20C	N	N
Unidentified Iron	1	61	19-20C	N	N
Modern Pottery	3	14	19-20C	Y	N
Tin Slag	1	5		N	N
Unidentified Copper alloy	2	1.5		N	N
Flint waste	4	36		N	N
Vessel glass	1	1		N	N
Iron fastner	4	25		N	N
Fired clay	3	21		N	N
Coal	1	3		N	N
Iron slag	3	131		N	N
Iron spike	1	39		N	N
Unidentified iron	8	198		N	N
Unidentified lead	4	129		N	N
Waste lead	1	5		N	N

Table 4: Summary of the Artefactual assemblage

6. Discussion

The lack of extensive areas of exposed surfaces due to the nature of the works meant that much of the route remained under substantial layers of subsoil with most of the new route being carried on embankments. This would of course imply that any underlying archaeology would have remained unidentified and preserved *in situ*. Yet a thorough inspection of the cleaned surfaces in two large areas in Area A, the southern half of Area B and the drainage ditches that run down the outer flanks of the whole route along with associated service trenches indicated that the whole area was devoid of any archaeological deposits, apart from the two parallel furrow ditches at the western end of Area A. The entire length of the road therefore remained substantially archaeologically sterile. This is also highlighted by the lack of substantial finds from across the entire length of the route from both the watching brief and the earlier evaluation.

The general absence of both archaeological features and associated material culture implies that this area of land has been used essentially for agricultural purposes. The possible cultivation marks and Roman pottery found during the evaluation in Area C (WSM23338) may be associated with the Roman occupation sites to the north of the new route, to the east of Norton (WSM 23490) and at Twyford (WSM 2759) (Hurst 2003). The thin scattering of Roman, medieval and post-medieval pottery across the rest of the route may have derived from the practice of spreading domestic waste across the fields. The archaeological and documentary evidence that we have for this area also leads us to infer a prolonged agricultural usage. The manor of Norton and Lenchwick, whose lands probably incorporated most the eastern end of the new route was, by the late 13th century, one of the most valuable properties on the Evesham Abbey estate (VCH II) suggesting that the considerable soil fertility of the Vale of Evesham was being exploited at this early period (Hurst 1996). The furrows in the west end of Area A, along with the cultivation marks in Area C (WSM 23338) and the wash pool (WSM23241) by the Lower Brook all help to substantiate that this landscape has a prolonged agricultural history.

With no battlefield evidence such as metal artefacts and other associated finds, the implications are, firstly, that the assumed location of the battlefield site is correct, being located to the south of the link road, on the southern slopes of Green Hill, leading down towards the River Avon and, secondly, that the location of the new route is far enough removed not to have any detrimental effects on any surviving archaeological evidence relating to the battle. The battle, having taken place in 1265 would have been prior to the introduction of muskets and musket balls into the medieval field of combat. It is very likely that any metalwork left after the battle would have been quickly gathered up and reused or melted down for other purposes. Likewise, arrowheads, where visible, are likely to have been gathered up, as these would have been an expensive commodity at this time.

Surrounding the battlefield there may have been located associated ancillary structures such as the followers' camps, though these are likely to have been of a very ephemeral nature and any slight archaeological traces would therefore have been susceptible to heavily truncation by the later arable use and the more recent planting of trees for the apple orchards. The watching brief did not find any sign of the chapel set up to commemorate the battle, the whereabouts of which are unknown, though as it was called the *chapel of Battlewell* in 1502, it was presumably near that feature which has been convincingly identified as the small pond just to the south-west of the crossroads with the A4184 Evesham to Redditch road (Cox 1988, 26), and therefore located some distance away from the development of the new road. No evidence was uncovered either for any burial sites associated with this battle, again documentary evidence placing the potential location towards Offenham, where a reference by Tindal in 1794 suggests bones having been ploughed up in a meadow near Offenham Bridge and *Dead Man's Ait* is a field-name along this reach of the River Avon. Both are likely to relate to the rout of the Montfordians who endeavoured to escape eastwards towards Offenham (Hurst 2003).

7. Conclusion

The watching brief confirmed the results of the prior evaluation, suggesting that the road development lay in an area that has always been used solely for agricultural purposes rather than for settlement. The lack of further information regarding the 1265 battle is likely to be down to the fact that the main battlefield site was elsewhere on Green Hill and any other skirmishes located further to the south and east, away from the location of the new road and the watching brief. It is interesting to note that not a single artefact was found that could be securely dated to the 13th century.

8. Publication summary

The Service has a professional obligation to publish the results of archaeological projects within a reasonable period of time. To this end, the Service intends to use this summary as the basis for publication through local or regional journals. The client is requested to consider the content of this section as being acceptable for such publication.

An archaeological watching brief was undertaken on behalf of Sir William Halcrow and Partners Ltd along the route of the Chadbury to Twyford link road, Evesham, Worcestershire, (NGR SP 0250 4630 – SP 1390 4615); SMR ref WSM 33603). The route of the proposed new road ran across the northwest corner of the 1265 Battle of Evesham battlefield site as designated by English Heritage. The watching brief completed the final phase of archaeological work on the site, following on from a desk-based assessment, a co-ordinated geophysical and fieldwalking survey and an evaluation in 1996.

The lack of extensive areas of exposed surfaces due to the nature of the works meant that much of the route remained under substantial layers of subsoil with extensive sections of the new route being carried on embankments. This would of course imply that any underlying archaeology would have remained unidentified and preserved in situ. Yet a thorough inspection of a number of sufficiently cleaned areas across various locations of the site and the drainage ditches that run down the outer flanks of the route along with associated service trenches indicated that the whole area was devoid of any archaeological deposits, except two parallel linear features towards the western edge. These were interpreted as the remains of ridge and furrow. The absence of any substantial quantity of archaeological artefacts also implies a prolonged agricultural usage for this area.

In addition to no visible archaeological remains, extensive metal detecting produced no medieval finds and so no trace of the battlefield was found. This suggests that the assumed location of the battlefield site is correct, being located to the southwest of the link road, on the southern slopes of Green Hill, leading down towards the river Avon and that the location of the new route is far enough removed not to have any detrimental effects on any surviving archaeology relating to the battle.

9. The archive

The archive consists of:

17	Fieldwork progress records AS2
7	Photographic records AS3
119	Digital photographs
36	Abbreviated context records AS40
13	Scale drawings
1	Box of finds
1	Computer disk (CD)

The project archive is intended to be placed at:

Worcestershire County Museum

Hartlebury Castle

Hartlebury

Near Kidderminster

Worcestershire DY11 7XZ

Tel Hartlebury (01299) 250416

10. Acknowledgements

The Service would like to thank the following for their kind assistance in the successful conclusion of this project, Mike Windsor and Dave Evans of Sir William Halcrow Ltd and Mike Glyde of Worcestershire County Council.

11. Personnel

The fieldwork and report preparation was led by Simon Sworn. The project manager responsible for the quality of the project was Derek Hurst. Fieldwork was undertaken by Anna Deeks, Simon Sworn and Tom Vaughan, finds analysis by Laura Griffin and illustration by Carolyn Hunt.

12. Bibliography

Astill, G, and Grant, A, 1988. *The countryside of medieval England*, Oxford

Carpenter, D, 1987 *The Battles of Lewes and Evesham 1264/1265* British Battlefield Series

County Archaeological Service, 1995 (as amended) *Manual of Service practice: fieldwork recording manual*, County Archaeological Service, Worcestershire County Council, report, **399**

Cox, D C, 1988 *The Battle of Evesham: a new account*, The Vale of Evesham Historical Society

de Laborderie, O, Maddicott, J R, and Carpenter, D A, (nd) 1987 *The last hours of Simon de Montfort*, Evesham Simon de Montfort Society

English Heritage, nd *Battlefield register: Evesham 1265*

HEAS, 2004a *Brief for an archaeological watching brief along the route of the Chadbury-Twyford link road, Evesham, Worcestershire,* Historic Environment and Archaeology Service, Worcestershire County Council unpublished document 2004

HEAS, 2004b *Proposal for an archaeological watching brief along the route of the Chadbury-Twyford link road, Evesham, Worcestershire*, Historic Environment and Archaeology Service, Worcestershire County Council, unpublished document dated 20 April 2004, **P2553**

Hurst, J D, and Rees, H, 1992 Pottery fabrics; a multi-period series for the County of Hereford and Worcester, in Woodiwiss, S G (ed), *Iron Age and Roman salt production and the medieval town of Droitwich*, CBA Res Rep, **81**

Hurst, J D, 1994 (as amended) *Pottery fabrics. A multi-period series for the County of Hereford and Worcester*, County Archaeological Service, Hereford and Worcester County Council, report, **445**

Hurst, J D, 1996 *Archaeological assessment of the proposed A4538 Chadbury-Twyford link road: desk-based study*, Worcestershire County Council unpublished internal report, **467**

Hurst, J D, 2003 *Archaeological assessment of the proposed Chadbury to Twyford link road, Worcestershire*, Worcestershire County Council unpublished internal report dated 1996, revised 31 May 2003, **1159**

IFA, 1999 *Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief,* Institute of Field Archaeologists

Ragg, J M, Beard, G R, George, H, Heaven, F W, Hollis, J M, Jones, R J A, Palmer, R C, Reeve, M J, Robson, J D, and Whitfield, W A D, 1984 *Soils and their use in midland and western England*, Soil Survey of England and Wales, **12**

Tindal, J, 1794 *The History and antiquities of the Abbey and Borough of Evesham*

VCH II, Page, W (ed), 1906 The Victoria History of the Counties of England. A history of Worcestershire

Webster, G, and Hobley, B, 1964 Aerial reconnaissance over the Warwickshire Avon, *Archaeol J*, 121, 1-22

13. Abbreviations

NGR	National Grid Reference.
SMR	Sites and Monuments Record.
WSM	Numbers prefixed with 'WSM' are the primary reference numbers used by the Worcestershire County Historic Environment Record

Appendix 1 Trench descriptions

Area A

Main deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface – top and bottom of deposits
100	Topsoil	Dark brown silty loam, occasional gravels, small sub-rounded pebbles and charcoal fragments. Heavy root disturbance.	0-0.2m
101	Subsoil	Mid brown silty clay. Occasional small sub-angular gravels and manganese flecks. Roots and fibrous material.	*c.* 0.20-0.30m
102	Natural	Mixed brown, light blue and grey lias clays overlying sub-angular gravels. Occasional manganese flecks	0.30m +
103	Furrow fill	Well compacted light reddish brown silty clay. Frequent small sub-angular gravels and occasional charcoal flecks.	0.30-0.37m
104	Furrow cut	NW-SE linear cut. Defuse, shallow, gentle edges and base. Filled by 103.	0.30-0.37m
105	Furrow fill	Well compacted light reddish brown silty clay. Frequent small sub-angular gravels and occasional charcoal and manganese flecks.	0.30-0.41m
106	Furrow cut	NW-SE linear cut. Defuse, shallow, gentle edges and base. Filled by 105.	0.30-0.41m
107	Furrow fill	Well compacted light reddish brown silty clay. Frequent small sub-angular gravels and occasional charcoal and manganese flecks.	0.30-0.36m
108	Furrow cut	NW-SE linear cut. Defuse, shallow, gentle edges and base. Filled by 107.	0.30-0.36m
109	Furrow fill	Well compacted light reddish brown silty clay. Frequent small sub-angular gravels and occasional charcoal and manganese flecks.	0.30-0.36m
110	Furrow cut	NW-SE linear cut. Defuse, shallow, gentle edges and base. Filled by 109.	0.30-0.36m
111	Mixed natural	Light beigh silty clay, occasional small sub-angular sandstones and gravels. Root disturbance.	0.04-0.58m

Area A (cont.)

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface – top and bottom of deposits
112	Natural	Light brown silty clay with patches of greyish blue lias clays and dark grey organic clay. Occasional small gravels.	0.58-1.05m
113	Natural	Mid brownish grey silty clay with patches of greyish blue lias clays. Some root disturbance.	1.05-1.10m
114	Natural	Pale greyish blue lias clay with patches of beigh silty clay. Occasional manganese flecks.	1.10-2.15m
115	Natural	Thin band of greyish blue lias clay blocks, *c.* 200mm x 100mm x 50mm	2.15-2.28m
116	Natural	Dark blueish grey silty clay. Occasional manganese flecks	2.28-2.50m
117	Natural	Light blueish beigh clayey silt. Occasional manganese flecks	2.50m +

Area B

Deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface – top and bottom of deposits
200	Topsoil	Dark brown silty loam, occasional gravels, small sub-rounded pebbles and charcoal fragments. Heavy root disturbance.	0-0.2m
201	Subsoil	Mid brown silty clay. Occasional small sub-angular gravels and manganese flecks. Roots and fibrous material.	*c.* 0.20-0.30m
202	Natural	Mixed brown, light blue and grey lias clays overlying sub-angular gravels. Occasional manganese flecks	0.30m +

Area C

Deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface – top and bottom of deposits
300	Topsoil	Dark brown silty loam, occasional gravels, small sub-rounded pebbles and charcoal fragments. Heavy root disturbance.	0-0.2m
301	Subsoil	Mid brown silty clay. Occasional small sub-angular gravels and manganese flecks. Roots and fibrous material.	*c.* 0.20-0.30m
302	Natural	Mixed brown, light blue and grey lias clays overlying sub-angular gravels. Occasional manganese flecks	0.30m +

Area D

Deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface – top and bottom of deposits
400	Topsoil	Dark brown silty loam, occasional gravels, small sub-rounded pebbles and charcoal fragments. Heavy root disturbance.	0-0.2m
401	Subsoil	Mid brown silty clay. Occasional small sub-angular gravels and manganese flecks. Roots and fibrous material.	*c.* 0.20-0.30m
402	Natural	Mixed brown, light blue and grey lias clays overlying sub-angular gravels. Occasional manganese flecks	0.30m +
403	Road Surface	Modern tarmac, present road surface	0-0.17m
404	Road Surface	Modern tarmac, earlier road surface	0.17-0.35m
405	Make-up layer	Small sub-angular pebbles, light brown sandy matrix	0.35-0.45m
406	Make-up layer	Small sub-rounded pebbles, light brown / yellow sandy matrix	0.45m-0.60m
407	Make-up layer	Dark brown silty sand, occasional clay	0.60-0.80m

Area D (cont.)

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface – top and bottom of deposits
408	Natural	Mixed brown, light blue and grey lias clays overlying sub-angular gravels. Occasional manganese flecks. Same as 402	0.80-0.90m
409	Natural	Thin band of greyish blue lias clay blocks, *c.* 200mm x 100mm x 50mm	0.90m+
410	Service trench	Concrete and sand filled service trench	0.17-1.00m
411	Service trench	Concrete and sand filled service trench, containing at least two ceramic pipes	0.17-1.00m

Area E

Deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface – top and bottom of deposits
500	Topsoil	Dark brown silty loam, occasional gravels, small sub-rounded pebbles and charcoal fragments. Heavy root disturbance.	0-0.2m
501	Subsoil	Mid brown silty clay. Occasional small sub-angular gravels and manganese flecks. Roots and fibrous material.	*c.* 0.20-0.30m
502	Natural	Mixed brown, light blue and grey lias clays overlying sub-angular gravels. Occasional manganese flecks	0.30m +

Plate 1: General view of middle of Area A, facing west

Plate 2: Furrow in Area A, facing northwest

Plate 3: General view of southern end of Area B, facing north

Plate 4: General view of Area C, facing south

Plate 5: Section through road, Area D, facing south

Plate 6: General view of western end of Area A and drainage ditch, facing southeast